UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,319	09/16/2003	Alexander Vincent Danilo	00169.002728.	9258
	7590 09/18/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/662,319	DANILO, ALEXANDER VINCENT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	2625			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 June 2008</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 17-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 17-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

• This action is responsive to the following communication: Request for continued

examination (RCE) filed on 06/23/2008.

• Claims 1-16 are cancelled.

Claims 17-20 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments, filed 06/23/2008 have been entered and fully

considered. In light of the applicant's amendments, the rejection(s) have been

withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection(s) have

been made, and applicant's arguments have been rendered moot.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

06/23/2008 has been entered.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied

to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations

are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over a Schiller et al., US 6,049,339 in view of Moore, US 2002/0015039.

Re claim 17, Schiller discloses a method of rendering an image (see figures 2-3), said method comprising the steps of: receiving a display list representation (see step 210, figure 2) comprising overlapping graphic objects (see figures 1-4; column 1, lines 37-58; column 3, lines 22-37; column 3, line 66-column 4, line 10); processing the display list representation in order to convert said overlapping graphical objects to visually equivalent non overlapping graphical objects (see figures 1-4; column 1, lines 37-58; column 3, line 10-column 4, line 10), wherein said non-overlapping graphical objects (i.e. regions 1,2,3 in figure 4) are bounded (surrounded) by non-intersecting

edges (see figure 4, note that none of the region 1, 2 or 3's paths (i.e. boundaries or edges, see column 3, lines 12-13) intersect with each other) (see figures 1, 4; column 3, line 66-column 4, line 10; column 1, lines 37-58), and at least one of the non-intersecting edges is shared by more than one of said non-overlapping objects (see figures 1, 4; column 3, line 66-column 4, line 10; column 1, lines 37-58, note that region 1 is associated only with path 1 and region 3 is associated only with path 2 but region 2 is associated with path overlap area and hence the non-intersecting edges of region 2's path is shared by more both region 1's path and region 2's path)

Schiller fails to explicitly disclose processing the display list representation on a perscan line basis.

However, Moore teaches processing the display list representation on a per-scan line basis (see paragraphs 6-7, 91, 101).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system for blending graphical objects as disclosed by Schiller to include the techniques for rendering graphical objects as taught by Moore for the benefit of having a system which performs "rendering of graphic objects with full functionality demanded by sophisticated graphic description languages without a need for intermediate storage of pixel image data during the rendering process" as taught by Moore at paragraph 322.

Re claim 18, Schiller further discloses wherein at least one of the overlapping objects is opaque (see figure 4).

Re Claim 19, claim 19 recites identical features, as claim 17, except claim 19 is an apparatus claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 17 are applicable for claim 19.

Re Claim 20, claim 20 recites identical features, as claim 17, except claim 20 merely deals with executing the method of claim 17 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 17 are applicable for claim 20.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/662,319 Page 6

Art Unit: 2625

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./ Examiner, Art Unit 2625 /King Y. Poon/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625